

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of Meeting Held October 18, 1991

- Present:** C.L. Bertrand; M. Yates; P. Bird; S. Carter; C.W. White; C. Foster; M. Kusy; P. Widden; M. Brian; M. Mendell; W. Knitter; J. Woodsworth; W. Sellers; J. Anderson; G.M. Decarie; J. Locke; P. Allen; W. Byers; A. Teffeteller; C. Gray; M. Poirier; N. Segalowitz; M. Ainley; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; G. Newsham; M. Pruska-Carroll; J. Snyder; J. Vidmar; D. Awasti; K. Beaudoin; K. Clement; H. Halsall; D. Haufschild; A. Leonhardt; B. Leonhardt; C. McManaman; G. Pahinis; D. Parent.
- Regrets:** F. Stevens; G. Kanaan; B. Lewis; J. Fiset; C. Levy.
- Absent:** J. Lightstone; J. Gavin; R. Pallen; E. Preston; G. Fisher; H. McQueen; G. Auchinachie; S. Kumarapeli; L. Crysler; R. Sharma; I. Robinson; C. Potworowski; J.F. Plamondon; E. Chan; M. Innes.
- Guests:** M. Oppenheim; M. Allor; Mr. R. Martin, Ms. V. Bowker.

Documents Distributed and Considered at this meeting:

- ASFC 91-8M-A** Election/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees
- ASFC 91-8M-A(1)** Notice of Election - Arts and Science Faculty Council Meeting, Friday November 15, 1991
- ASFC 91-8M-B** Proposal for the School of Graduate Studies
- ASFC 91-8M-C** Degree Nomenclature - Notice of Motion from Senate
- ASFC 91-8M-D** Degree Nomenclature - Notice of Motion from Arts and Science Faculty Council Steering Committee
- ASFC 91-8M-E** Faculty of Arts and Science Fall Graduation List
- ASFC 91-8M-F** Memo from Dr. B. MacKay, Academic Programmes Committee regarding ASFC Report 73U
- For Information** Questionnaire Distributed to the Psychology Department on Degree Nomenclature

1. Call to Order

Dr. Bertrand called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Dr. Bertrand asked that the agenda be amended to include Item 2A, Remarks from the Chair.

91-8M-1 It was moved and seconded (White/Bird) that the Agenda be approved as amended.

Carried.

2(a). Remarks from the Chair

Dr. Bertrand remarked on the article recently published in Maclean's Magazine on universities in Canada which placed Concordia 31 out of 46 universities surveyed. In his opinion, the questions were skewed in favour of small colleges and universities, and not the urban universities with heavy part-time student enrolments such as Concordia. He did not wish Council members to be overly concerned about the survey. The Rector and the Dean of Arts and Science would respond in the next edition of *Concordia's Thursday Report*. He noted that although McGill was ranked No. 1, McGill had 200 students in its introductory classes and students found it difficult to meet with their professors. Dr. Bertrand urged students to talk to others in the community about their own feelings about Concordia's educational experience.

3. Approval of Graduation Lists

Dr. Bertrand thanked Mr. Ray Martin and Ms. V. Bowker for attending our meeting and supplying the Graduation Lists.

91-8M-2 It was moved and seconded (Knitter/Byers) that the Bachelor of Arts candidates (pages 1-15) be approved.

Changes to "Students not completing requirements for the Bachelor of Arts":
-Elizabeth Frieri, late completion received, to be added to Graduating List
-Jennifer Claire Tanyan, permission granted to retain credit for MATH 242 and

MATH 243, to be added to Graduating List

Carried.

91-8M-3 It was moved and seconded (Newsham/Snyder) that the Bachelor of Education candidates (page 16) be approved.

Carried.

91-8M-4 It was moved and seconded (Segalowitz/Adamson) that the Bachelor of Science candidates (pages 17-19) be approved.

Carried.

91-8M-5 It was moved and seconded (Knitter/Bird) that the Graduate Program candidates (pages 20-29) be approved.

Changes to "Pending" on Page 33:

-Christopher Ferdinand McNicolls, change of grade received, to be added to Graduating List

Carried.

91-8M-6 It was moved and seconded (Newsham/Ainley) that the Certificate Program candidates (pages 30-31) be approved.

Carried.

Dr. Bertrand requested volunteers for an Ad-Hoc Committee to work on tidying up late completions so that all students on the "problems" lists would graduate. Dr. Sylvia Carter, Professor Joanne Locke and Mr. Ray Martin volunteered.

4. Election/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees

Arts and Science Faculty Steering Committee

Deepak Awasti (POLI)

Ratified

Arts and Science Faculty Council

Deepak Awasti (POLI)

Kim Beaudoin

Eileen Chan

Kriss Clement

Hayley Halsall

Daniel Haufschild

Michael Innes

Aaron Leonhardt

Chris McManaman

George Pahinis

David Parent

Ratified

University Senate

Professor Maria Peluso (POLI)

Elected by Secret Ballot

Senate Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

Dr. J. Herz (ENGL)

Acclaimed

Board of Graduate Studies

Dr. R. Rudin (HIST)

Acclaimed

Graduate Awards Committee

Dr. E. Gavaki (SOCI)

Acclaimed

Arts and Science Computer Resources Committee

No nominations for student members at this time.

Arts and Science Faculty Curriculum Committee

Dr. J. Sullivan (EXCI)

Acclaimed

No nominations for student members at this time.

Arts and Science Faculty Panel - (Academic Regulations Regarding Cheating)

Kim Beaudoin

Kriss Clement

Chris McManaman

Ratified

Arts and Science Committee on General Education

Dr. T. Gray (PSYC)

Elected by Secret Ballot

Arts and Science Faculty Appeal Committee - (Regulations Regarding Academic Re-evaluation)

Hayley Halsall

Ratified

Arts and Science Faculty Honours Committee

No nominations for student members at this time.

Arts and Science Student Request Committee

Kriss Clement

Ratified

NOTICE OF ELECTIONS**Board of Graduate Studies Curriculum Committee**

One (1) full-time faculty member from the Faculty of Arts and Science (two-year term)

Search Committee for a Dean of Arts and Science

(Election to be held at the meeting of the Arts and Science Faculty Council on November 15, 1991.)

Four (4) Faculty members from the Faculty of Arts and Science, recommended by the Arts and Science Faculty Council, with at least one from each of the sciences, the humanities and the social sciences.

Two (2) Undergraduate students from the Faculty of Arts and Science, recommended by Faculty Council.

One (1) Graduate Student from the Faculty of Arts and Science, recommended by Faculty Council.

Nominations will be accepted in the Dean's Office 5:00 p.m. until November 5th, 1991.

Dr. Newsham asked how students who were interested in being elected to serve

on Arts and Science Faculty Council could become Council members.

Mr. Awasti responded that students should speak to either himself or Mr. Joe Serruya at the CUSA Offices downtown where they would complete an application form and be interviewed.

Dr. Bertrand suggested that it might be useful to publish this information in the CUSA handbook.

5. Proposal for a School of Graduate Studies

91-8M-7 It was moved and seconded (Widden/Knitter) that the Faculty of Arts and Science approve the Proposal for a School of Graduate Studies as circulated in document ASFC 91-8M-B.

Dr. Byers raised a question, directed to Dr. Kusy, the Acting Dean of Graduate Studies. He wished to know why the Arts and Science representation on the Council of the School of Graduate Studies was to be only five members when it was so much larger than the other faculties who were also to have five members on the Council.

Dr. Kusy responded that each faculty had equal representation. The notion of allocating the same number of members from each faculty on university committees was one that had been evolving and had now become common practice on many university committees.

Dr. Byers said that there would be implications for the Faculty of Arts and Science. With such a limited number of representatives there would not be enough Arts and Science members for all of its constituencies which could adversely affect the faculty. He would prefer a situation where the ratio would be 2 to 1, as the Faculty of Arts and Science could easily be two faculties at the present time as was the case in many other universities. He strongly urged that Arts and Science should have a larger membership on the Council of the School of Graduate Studies.

91-8M-7 It was moved and seconded (Byers/Anderson) that the Faculty of Arts and Science approve that the membership of the Council of the School of Graduate Studies be amended to increase the number of faculty members from Arts and Science to 8 and to reduce representation from each of the other Faculties to 4 members.

Dr. Segalowitz asked if a rationale would go forward with this amendment if it were to be adopted.

Dr. Bertrand responded that in that eventuality, he would ask Dr. Byers to prepare a rationale to accompany the request to amend the motion.

Dr. White presumed that the other faculties were looking at this document as well and asked what would happen at Senate if the other faculties were against this amendment.

Dr. Bertrand responded that the majority would rule.

Carried, with one opposed

Mr. Parent asked why undergraduate students were excluded from the membership of the Council of the School of Graduate Studies.

Acting Dean Kusy explained that the School of Graduate Studies and the Council of the School of Graduate Studies concerned graduate students and he did not see a role for undergraduate students on it.

Mr. Haufschild noted that whatever happened at the graduate level would filter down and affect the undergraduate population. He felt that undergraduate representation was indeed necessary on the Council of the School of Graduate Studies.

Dr. Bertrand assured Council that across Canada it would not be usual to find undergraduate representatives on graduate studies boards and councils.

Dr. Newsham reminded Council that the use of resources and how graduate resources impacted on undergraduate studies had been a heated issue at the meeting of Council when the School for Graduate Studies was last discussed.

Dr. Knitter pointed out that future proposals for change would have to come through the Arts and Science Faculty Council and/or Senate and those would be the appropriate bodies where undergraduate students could voice their concerns.

Mr. Leonhardt asked if interested members of the university community could attend meetings of the Council of the School of Graduate Studies.

Acting Dean Kusy responded that the meetings were to be open.

Mr. Awasti asked whether a liaison arrangement could be made so that undergraduate students would have speaking privileges on the Council of the School of Graduate Studies.

Dr. Bertrand said that such a request should be made by letter from the undergraduate students' union to the Dean of Graduate Students.

Dr. Kusy agreed that he would welcome undergraduate students to contact him in this connection.

91-8M-7 **It was moved and seconded (Widden/Knitter) that the Faculty of Arts and Science approve the Proposal for a School of Graduate Studies (document ASFC 91-8M-B) as amended in Dr. Byers' motion.**

Carried; 24 in favour, 7 against, 1 abstention.

Dr. Bertrand informed Council that with the voting out of the way he felt free to inform Council that he would vote against the amendment to the motion at Senate. The Faculty of Arts and Science was a large and unified body with a single Dean. One Dean spoke for the whole Faculty of Arts and Science and the other faculties have come to recognize that oneness. In addition, Arts and Science had more members at Senate than the other faculties. The issue of faculty representation had been raised and it was felt that the time had come to treat Arts and Science as one faculty with equal faculty representation as any of the other three.

Mr. Awasti wished to explain that the students voted against the motion because the information given to the students was not substantial. Certain issues were raised in terms of structure as well as the impact on undergraduate studies. He also wished to know who represented the undergraduate students on Senate so that their concerns could be raised there.

Dr. Bertrand said that many of the concerns of the undergraduate students had already been discussed at a Spring Council meeting when this issue had been dealt with.

Mr. Awasti asked what were the mechanisms for undergraduate students to have their input into policies in the university.

Dr. Bertrand responded that there were student representatives on the University Budget Committee, the University Senate, and on the Senate Academic Priorities and Planning Committee (SCAPP). He also reiterated what Dr. Knitter had pointed out earlier that resource implications would be dealt with at these bodies.

6. Degree Nomenclature

Dr. Bertrand asked Council for speaking privileges for Dr. Oppenheim. There were no objections.

91-8M-8

It was moved and seconded (Widden/Sellers) that Arts and Science Faculty Council approve the second paragraph of the document ASFC-91-8M-D, Notice of Motion from Arts and Science Faculty Council.

Dr. Decarie said that since the last Council meeting he had thought the issue over including some of the objections he had had at that time. One of his objections had been to the word Magisteriate. However, he was continually coming across new words and part of the process of language was the development of new words. As well, Council was informed that the newly coined word, Magisteriate also had a masculine base but most of the nouns in the English language which describe persons were masculine based. Also, it was true that a change in degree nomenclature had not been requested by a large number of persons but should we retain degree nomenclature that was objectionable to even a few? The question to be examined was whether the old degree nomenclature was biased and if it was then we had a responsibility to recommend a change. This was not a perfect solution however if we agree that there had been discrimination in nomenclature Council should 'bite the bullet' and recommend fairness. He would therefore vote in favour of the motion.

Dr. Teffeteller begged Council's indulgence as she wished to go into some detail on the subject. She noted that there were three aspects to the issue: whether or not to adopt new nomenclature; whether or not to allow students a choice between old and new; and what was to be the new nomenclature. She meant to speak only to the third point. The purpose of the exercise as she understood it was to provide degree nomenclature that is and/or is perceived to be non-gender-aligned, gender-neutral - a commendable goal but a difficult task, trapped as we were by our own language. For the purpose of providing gender-neutral terminology there were problems with both the proposed (and established) terms 'doctorate' and 'baccalaureate', on the one hand, and the proposed (and coined) term, 'magisteriate' on the other.

Dr. Teffeteller further noted that a noun such as 'doctorate' or 'magisteriate' was a secondary derivative from a verbal (or adjectival/adverbial) root; meaning that one began with, e.g., the verbal root *doc* in Latin, as in *doceo* 'I teach'. To this root one attached an agent suffix - in this case *tor* - to designate the person who

effected the action indicated by the verbal root. Then, to the agent noun - in this case 'doctor' - one attached an additional suffix - here *ate* to form a new noun indicating what the agent had accomplished by the action.

In Indo-European languages, which included English and Latin (and English, incidentally, had borrowed all the words in question (doctor, master, bachelor, baccalaureate, etc.) from Latin; they were not inherited from Germanic), there was a very productive agent suffix in **tor** (as in 'doctor'); it was a masculine suffix, indicating a male agent of action. The corresponding feminine suffix, indicating a female agent of action, was **trix** (as in 'doctrrix'). English also used (and these forms were in fact more common in English) **oress** (as in 'doctoress') and the even more usual form **ress** (as in actress).

There was a second suffix in the Indo-European languages, of similar form, in **ter**. The early history of this suffix was complicated by its use as a comparative/constrastive suffix. However, there was no ambiguity in the gender marking: the masculine form was **ter**, indicating a male agent of action; the feminine form was **tra**, indicating a female agent of action (cf. the Latin pair 'magister' being a man in control, a teacher, a master vs. 'magistra' a woman in control, a female teacher, a mistress).

If Council were to adopt the proposed term 'magisteriate', someday some feminist student who knew a little Latin or simply looked in the dictionary would petition for a 'magistriate' and we would be back to the drawing board. The proposed term 'magisteriate', incorporating as it did a masculine suffix as opposed to a feminine suffix, was not a gender-neutral term and was open to the same objection as the current term 'master'.

Efforts at inclusive usage (as was now generally accepted for 'doctor' and as some people would claim for 'master' as was implicit in the proposal of 'magisteriate') encountered the problem of a built-in gender hierarchy resulting from our culture's privileging of the male at the expense of the female. To illustrate, Dr. Teffeteller referred to a popular riddle, the point of which was that most people's first assumption was that a doctor was a man - even among people who deplored such assumptions, although everyone knew that there were doctors and women-doctors, lawyers and women-lawyers, professors and women-professors.

Dr. Poirier noted that Baccalaureate was the term used in the french high school system and cautioned Council to keep this fact in mind.

Dr. Gray stated that he also wished to deal in some detail with the issue and had with him a prepared statement. First, he disagreed with Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale, when she claimed that providing a choice among degree titles, was absurd.

"Even if the new titles prevailed, there was no way but by choice between them, to avoid victimizing present students, and to keep future able and serious students from simply taking their trade elsewhere, to some university that did not look like a trendy, 2nd (or 31st) rate charlatan, with its funny degrees. Only by allowing some escape from the simply cockamamie scheme our Senate was poised to inflict upon them will they continue to come to us."

Secondly, he disagreed with Dr. Oppenheim, that this change was either moral, or politic. Scholars may know by study the influence of words upon awareness; but scholars also knew, firsthand, the excessive agenda built upon a minute quibble, which academics especially were prone to perpetrate.

In our case, no moral imperative of justice or fairness demanded this change, but rather too heightened a sensibility, as stalking horse for a commonplace attempt to consolidate power. One needed to feel, for example, no challenge or even address to one's maleness, from being known as a 'midwife' quo philosopher, or in having identity as a "bride" of Christ qua Christian, or in coming gowned instead of pantsed to our commencement exercises. He failed to see why his friends must feel their gender to be disreputable, by the commonplaces of their iconography and grammar.

As well, he stated that it may be true that some of his friends had been led to feel disrespected by such word use. But it was not politic to cast our future into the temporarily fashionable, lockstep-mold of this distress. It was no more politic than to cast Canada's future into deference to Quebec's linguistic injustices. Both wished others to feel misplaced guilt, until some such time when either decided that its inferiority complex had abated - and that the boundless appetite for power was sated.

He argued that no one can be ashamed of achieving mastery of her studies; what else was there to do with studies, but to fail in them. He felt what was being asked was to trade-in Mastery, in exchange for Mystery. He urged Council not to agree to do it!

In the third instance he disagreed with Dr. Newsham, that the name for a subject, "master" must be retained rather than the noun for an object, "mastery" or "magisteriate". Our culture had moved on, past the conviction, that learning added to the stature, the quality, to the degree of one's attainment to personhood. We consider learning no longer a degree of self-making, but as the product of work, even as the tool toward the labour of living. As one no longer "is graduated" into a university's privileges, rights and immunities, but "graduates" for oneself under one's own powers, so one now will earn a magisteriate, rather than become a master. Let us not be behind the times, and continue to announce that education improved us.

Nonetheless, fourthly and finally, he disagreed again with Dr. Oppenheim, in his claim that the problems of awarding such objective degrees have been solved. Nothing was said in his report, to address the issue of making these new names acceptable to other universities and our governmental ministries, to the professional corporations and our students' employers. Their likely refusal to value new names was reason enough to throw out Ms. Gammon's request on page 3 of the report (though her "Mistress" of Arts could also have had "M.A." attached.)

But on page 4, this problem was said to be not serious, so far as the "Magisteriate" of Arts was concerned, with not another word having been offered as to the reason why we should no longer be worried about it. This was a transparently threadbare reassurance, all set to unravel. That the first name-change was for one student, while the present one was for many, added no more a justifying reason, but only an indication of how many more students would be victimized by Council carrying such a motion.

Because of this, he urged Council to reject this Senate motion unanimously. He felt that today's students would be thankful as will those who, then, will not be too ashamed to come here in future years. By rejecting this motion, he felt that Council will serve its own best interests.

Dr. Decarie said that English was a living language and the result was that people who expected a doctor to be a man came to that conclusion historically. The image that these words conveyed changed with time.

Mr. Haufschild stated that this issue had both legal and public implications. This was a compromise. He said that this was a situation where language was being changed to accommodate an idea. This ridiculed the notion that things would change. We were spending a lot of time and effort on this issue when what should be done was to redirect our efforts to address and change old attitudes.

Mr. Awasti agreed with Dr. Teffeteller that changes had to be made. It might be politically correct and less offensive but it was because we realized that those terms degraded a people that change was needed. He argued that when we looked at the idea of changing the term Master's, we had to look at a broader plane. The world out there was a very conservative place to live in and that if we did not change then we could not change the world. If the terms were offensive then they should be changed.

Ms. Halsall said that she heard all points of view. She felt that the students at Council were representing a large number of other students and she did not know what most of them felt about the issue and wanted more time to find out what their feelings were. She also said that students felt they did not have a voice

where issues like this were concerned. She did not feel that the term Master's was a sexist term and also that Master's was an ambiguous term in that it could mean 'mastering' a subject. She said that she was conservative but she felt that students should be given the choice of nomenclature. She reminded Council that degrees were conferred on students not necessarily only from Quebec and Canada but from other countries and should have the choice of nomenclature. She felt that the issue should be re-examined again after five years.

Mr. Leonhardt addressed his comments to the remarks made by Dr. Decarie. He agreed that our language was living and dynamic, and neologisms were perfectly allowable when they happened naturally. That was the key not only for language issues but for the whole attitude surrounding the issue. He questioned whether this change was really necessary as everyone would have to live with it. He did not think that we should hesitate over the roots of the word. People were going to be offended no matter what we did so that should not be a factor in coming to a decision.

Dr. Widden said that there were three factors to consider: 1) Was the 'Master's' degree sexist - many interpret it as mastery of a discipline; 2) If the term was sexist, was changing the name the most productive way of dealing with the problem; 3) Was the new nomenclature any less sexist?

Mr. Parent argued that history did come into the question. He stated that things did not change but people did. Historically, when people recognized the importance of change, change came about and women must be aware that change was important. The university had always been one of the most progressive parts of society. If it was felt the term Magisteriate would deter students from coming to Concordia he wished to point out that if a student was accepted to a graduate program at this University he/she would be glad to be accepted and would not worry about the nomenclature. Change was the most important message here.

Dr. Oppenheim said that there were two issues he wished Council to consider: 1) Whether there was an injustice in the present nomenclature; and 2) Did the suggestions redress that injustice. He noted that it was hard for those in the majority to recognize an injury when it was not directed to them. It was easy to think that their words were everyone's words. People would therefore find it difficult to see injustice in the current nomenclature. This was an honest attempt to redress the situation. He did not know if it was trendy to address an injustice but other universities, namely Calgary and Toronto, were also addressing the issue. He hoped that the new nomenclature indicated that the university was a place for everyone. This university could not change its degrees unilaterally but Senate would have to engage in a dialogue with other universities and finally with the Conseil des universités. However, Concordia did have the power to step forward and ask for change when change was called for.

Dr. Newsham thought that it was worth restating that adjectives were not marked for gender and it was the degree not the person that should be named; therefore the discussion was unnecessary.

Sr. Prudence Allen asked Council to reflect on two particular aspects. If the shift was to be from the person to the degree then the words were being shifted into another mode. In Philosophy the root was feminine. Would the words 'Doctor of Philosophy' and 'Master of Arts' still be shown on the degree. She recollected that a policy statement in favour of the Ms. title had sent similar shockwaves throughout the university community a few years ago. Language was continually evolving and she would vote for change.

Ms. Clément said that the argument was based on the premise that the old term was sexist. She would like to see a student referendum to know how the students felt about this. If the terms were no longer perceived as being sexist then there was no need for a change.

Dr. Ainley said that most of the people historically who mastered a discipline were men. From the 1890s to 1990s most of the people teaching and receiving their degrees were men. She believed that the word master had sexist implications. Also in slave holding societies, masters were the ones with power. Therefore, changing the degree nomenclature would fit in beautifully with the university's mission statement of inclusion. She believed that other universities would follow Concordia's lead in making these changes.

Mr. Pahinis stated that he came to this university believing that he would receive a bachelor's degree and now after many years and \$30,000, he was faced with the possibility that he might receive a baccalaureate. If he had to move elsewhere he did not want his degree to be perceived as trendy.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale said that this was an opportunity (not only based on gender but also age and experience) to set up a dialogue on the issue. It would be a pity to eliminate the opportunity for dialogue very quickly. This issue did not concern only the people in this room or in this university but elsewhere. It would be a serious drawback and an insult to women who were concerned about this not to address the issue. Council ought not to turn down the possibility of a chance for change. If we were to be a reputable institution in this society we should not ignore the opportunity for change. Words and nomenclature were agents for change. She hoped the discussions at Faculty Council were only the beginning of a dialogue which would not end with this meeting of Council.

Dr. White said that he was in favour of the motion. He had concerns beforehand about the notion of choice but he no longer felt that it was a problem.

Dr. Carter drew Council's attention to the questionnaire circulated by the Department of Psychology which did not seem to show support for the motion. She asked Dr. Segalowitz for an explanation.

Dr. Segalowitz said that after the last meeting of Council he developed and circulated the questionnaire to have a better idea of what the Psychology students, many of whom were women, thought about the proposed change. The results showed that the vote was 3 to 1 against change in nomenclature. 17 elaborated that they either did not like the term Magisteriate and/or that they took Master's to mean mastering. He felt that the high score against the term Baccalaureate was because it used for the high school leaving certificate in the French school system in Quebec and that perhaps also Bachelor appeared to be more sexist on the face of it.

Mr. Vidmar noted that Baccalaureate was accepted in North America for a bachelor's degree.

Ms. Halsall said that Council was making the same error that politicians make. She was hearing that if a change was made, students would accept it. Politicians use the same strategy when they impose taxes on the general public. She was in favour of choice of nomenclature.

- 91-8M-8** It was moved and seconded (Widden/Sellers) that Arts and Science Faculty Council approve the second paragraph of the document ASFC-91-8M-D, Notice of Motion from Arts and Science Faculty Council.

Motion was Defeated: 7 for; 14 against; 8 abstentions

7. Other Business

Dr. Bertrand referred to a memo from the Associate Vice Rector, Academic (ASFC 91-8M-F) concerning Curriculum Report 73U and requested a motion to withdraw the six new courses being offered by Political Science.

- 91-8M-9** It was moved and seconded (Carter/Clément) that the six new courses proposed by the Department of Political Science be withdrawn from Curriculum Report 73U until a rationale has been provided, and a similar number of courses offered in the Calendar had been deleted.

Carried.

Dr. Bertrand explained that at the last meeting of Council when Curriculum Report 73U had been approved, he felt constrained by being Chair not to voice his objections. He felt that the curriculum for the Faculty of Arts and Science should be top rate and that the Department of Political Science needed to examine its course offerings more closely and resubmit their curriculum changes.

Mr. Awasti informed Council that he felt that present course offerings in the History of Political Theory did not adequately deal with political philosophers other than those in Europe and he would forward a letter and documentation on this subject to Steering Committee.

Mr. Awasti said that he would also like Council to deal with a number of issues which he intended to bring forward in the future. One had to do with international students and transfer credits. He would also like the issue of recycled paper to be looked at and asked the Dean to utilize double-sided printing. A third topic was intercultural education. Finally, he mentioned that QPIRG was trying to create links with professors on social issues to create a think tank and asked anyone on Council interested in participating to speak with him.

Professor Brian asked if a special Council meeting to deal with the Space Report would be held before the Senate meeting of November 1.

Dr. Bertrand said that we would probably discuss it at the November 15 meeting of Council if the scenarios were published in *Concordia's Thursday Report* as had been promised. However, if a special meeting needed to be called, he would do so.

8. Next Meeting

The next meeting of Arts and Science Faculty Council is scheduled for November 15, 1991 at 2:00 p.m. in Room DL-200.

9. Adjournment

91-8M-10 It was moved and seconded (Segalowitz/Clément) that the meeting be adjourned at 11:40.